Table 3-5: Impacts of Short-Line Routing Alternatives: Land Use and Recreation

Alternative	Impacts
McNary Substation Alternatives	
A. Relocate administration building presently located on north side of substation adjacent to Wildlife Natural Area	Wildlife viewing may be temporarily obstructed during construction.
B. Cross Wildlife Natural Area; circumvent administration building on north side	Wildlife viewing may be temporarily obstructed during construction.
C. Place line in bus work at ground level on north side of administration building, inside Wildlife Natural Area	No recreation impacts are anticipated.
Hanford-John Day Junction Alternatives	
A. Move existing Hanford-John Day line north 200 feet to make room for new line on north side of corridor	Approximately ~~1.5~~ 3.0 acres of grazing land would be disturbed during construction of six towers. The permanent project facilities (towers and roads) would occupy approximately ~~0.25~~2.4 acres of grazing land. No recreation impacts are anticipated.
B. Place new line on south side of corridor	Approximately ~~3.2~~ 3.6 acres of grazing land would be permanently impacted (occupied by roads and towers) and about ~~0.5~~ 4.0 acres of grazing land would be temporarily impacted during construction of eight towers. No recreation impacts are anticipated. The occupants of the residence would be impacted by having their barn and shed removed. If the house requires removal, the residents would have to find new housing.
C. Place new line on south side of highway (occupied by roads and towers)	Approximately ~~3.2~~ 6.8 acres of grazing land ~~and 3.1 acres of cropland~~ would be permanently impacted (towers and roads). Approximately ~~0.5~~ 5.0 acres of grazing land would be temporarily impacted during construction of 10 towers. No recreation impacts are anticipated. Impacts to the residence would be the same as Alternative B, though the towers would be located about 35 feet closer to the house.
Corridor Mile 32 Alternatives	
A. Keep existing and new lines on tribal land	Approximately ~~0.6~~ 0.8 acre of cropland would permanently impacted (occupied by roads and towers) and about ~~0.8~~ 2.0 acres would be temporarily impacted during construction of four towers. No recreation impacts are anticipated.
B. Relocate existing and new lines away from tribal land	Approximately ~~1.8~~ 1.0 acre~~s~~ of cropland would be permanently impacted (occupied by roads and towers) and about ~~2.25~~ 2.5 acres would be temporarily impacted during construction of five towers. No recreation impacts are anticipated.

Table 3-5, continued

Alternative	Impacts
Corridor Mile 35 Alternatives	
A. Keep existing and new lines on tribal land	Approximately 0.8 acre of grazing land would be permanently impacted (occupied by roads and four towers) and about ~~1.0~~ 2.0 acres would be temporarily impacted during construction. No recreation impacts are anticipated.
B. Relocate existing and new lines away from tribal land	Approximately ~~1.5~~ 1.0 acres of grazing land would be permanently impacted (occupied by roads and five towers) and about ~~2~~ 2.5 acres would be temporarily impacted during construction. No recreation impacts are anticipated.

Table 3-12: Permanent Impacts to Vegetation (acres)

Vegetation Cover Type	Total Acres in Project Area	Percent Cover in Project Area	Permanent Impacts from Tower Construction	Permanent Impacts from Road Operation & Maintenance	Substation Impacts	Total Permanent Impacts
Agricultural	~~1,409~~ 1,415	31	5	~~12~~ 18	0	~~17~~ 23
Grassland	900	20	4	8	2	14
Grazed Shrub-Steppe	~~1,700~~ 1,709	38	7	~~23~~ 32	0	~~30~~ 39
Riparian	38	1	0	0	0	0
Scabland/Lithosol Communities	294	7	1	3	0	4
Shrub-dominated Shrub-Steppe	132	3	1	2	0	3
Total	4,473	100	18	~~48~~ 63	2	~~68~~ 83